ESTTA Tracking number:

ESTTA573385

Filing date:

11/26/2013

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Proceeding	91211736	
Party	Plaintiff Kittrich Corporation	
Correspondence Address	MARK CALKINS KITTRICH CORPORATION 14555 ALONDRA BLVD LA MIRADA, CA 90638 UNITED STATES markc@kittrich.com, kevinr@kittrich.com	
Submission	Motion to Strike	
Filer's Name	Mark A. Calkins	
Filer's e-mail	markc@kittrich.com	
Signature	//Mark A. Calkins//	
Date	11/26/2013	
Attachments	Motion to Strike - 112613.pdf(246671 bytes )	

# IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD Kittrich Corporation Opposition No.: 91211736

Opposer,

Mark: LITTLE TWIGS BABY CHILD MAMA

Serial No. 85/659719

vs. Filed: June 23, 2012

Applicant.

Little Twigs, LLC Published: July 23, 2013

OPPOSER'S MOTION TO STRIKE APPLICANT'S RESPONSE

Opposer Kittrich Corporation ("Kittrich") hereby moves the Board, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(f) and TBMP § 506, to strike in its entirety the untimely, untitled document filed with the Board by Applicant Little Twigs LLC ("Applicant") on November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2013 or November 20<sup>th</sup>, 2013 ("Response"). In support of this Motion, Applicant states the following:

- 1. Kittrich's Motion is predicated on Applicant's failure, yet again<sup>1</sup>, to comply with the Board's Scheduling Order, and applicable rules including Fed. Rule Civ. P. 8(b). Kittrich and Applicant should be able to rely on the expectation that the other will conduct its case and seek to protect its rights, such as they are, according to the rules of this Board and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Applicant has blatantly and repeatedly failed to follow such rules, and has instead relied on its *pro se* status as an excuse for failing to comply with the rules and regulations that govern these proceedings. (Opposer notes that it is representing itself as well.)
- 2. As a result, Kittrich has been incapable of timely and effectively prosecuting its case, which has prejudiced and continues to prejudice Kittrich, and caused it to incur undue delay, burden and expense. Applicant has failed to appropriately represent itself before this Board after having been provided multiple opportunities to do so.

28
Motion to Strike Applicant's Response

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Applicant's Response was initially due September 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2013.

- 3. On July 24<sup>th</sup>, 2013 Kittrich filed its Notice of Opposition, and on that same date the Board set an Answer date of September 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2013. Concurrent with filing the Notice of Opposition with the Board, Kittrich provided a service copy of the same by first class mail to Applicant's address of record.
- 4. Applicant did not timely file an Answer, and on September 4<sup>th</sup>, 2013, Kittrich filed a Motion for Default Judgment with the Board. The Motion for Default Judgment is still pending. In an October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2013 Notice to the Applicant, the Board, after locating Applicant at a new address, extended until November 16<sup>th</sup>, 2013 the time for the Applicant to file an Answer to the Notice of Opposition. The Board's October 7<sup>th</sup> Notice reads in pertinent part:

Notice is hereby given that unless the applicant listed herein, its assigns or legal representatives shall enter an appearance, answer or other response to the petition within the timeframe allowed, the opposition may proceed as in the case of default.

5. On November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2013 or November 20<sup>th</sup>, 2013, the Response, an untitled paper purported to be provided by the Applicant, was received by the Board. The Response appears to have been dated "November 16<sup>th</sup>, 2012" by the Applicant, bears a USPTO date of receipt stamp of 11-19-2013, and is listed on the US Patent and Trademark Office website with a date of 11/20/2013. There is no indication that the Response was delivered by "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service of the United States Postal Service under 37 C.F.R. § 1.10, nor is there any indication that the Response was sent by facsimile or provided with a certification in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.6.

#### I. Applicant's Response Fails to Comply with FRCP 8(b)

6. Kittrich's Notice of Opposition, filed *pro se* by Kittrich, was detailed and specific, and provided Applicant more than ample notice of the grounds on which this opposition is based. Kittrich's Notice of Opposition includes 24 numbered paragraphs of the facts and allegations, plus a prayer for relief. In an apparent attempt to address Kittrich's Notice, Applicant filed its (untimely) less than 1 full page, 7 paragraph "Response," which fails to respond, admit or deny any of Kittrich's allegations or prayers for relief.

<sup>2</sup> In a tortured construction Applicant's own allegations could possibly be construed as veiled denials of certain of Kittrich's allegations, but Kittrich should not be tasked with sifting through Applicant's blatantly incomplete Response, interpreting its allegations against the Notice, and attempting to divine which of Kittrich's allegations might have been admitted or denied. Kittrich deserves to understand where it stands in this proceeding under Board rules. See TBMP 312.03 and 318.02(b) ("The primary purpose of pleadings, under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, is

to give fair notice of the claims or defenses asserted.")

7. Applicant's Response clearly fails to comply with Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(b)(1):

"[I]n responding to a pleading, a party must state in short and plain terms its defenses to each claim asserted against it; and...admit or deny the allegations asserted against it by an opposing party."

- 8. Applicant's Response uses the terms "not just", "disingenuous", "frivolous nonsense" and other words to describe the Notice, but never once makes anything close to a blanket denial or admission of Kittrich's allegations, let alone a more specific denial or admission of even one of those allegations.<sup>2</sup> All of the numbered paragraphs of the Response violates applicable procedural law, and should be stricken.
- 9. To the extent that the Response purports to set forth any affirmative defenses or counterclaims, the same should be stricken as lacking any amount of particularity that would be required to provide the minimum amount of notice required under Fed. R. Civ. P. 8.
- 10. In the alternative, if the Board determines Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(b)(1) does not compel the Response to be stricken, Kittrich requests that the Board rule the allegations of the Notice admitted pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(b)(6) ("An allegation -- other than one relating to the amount of damages -- is admitted if a responsive pleading is required and the allegation is not denied.")
- 11. In addition, Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(f) allows the Board, on its own or upon motion, to strike from a pleading an insufficient defense or any redundant, immaterial, impertinent or scandalous matter. At a minimum, paragraphs numbered 2, 5, 6 and 7 of the Response should be stricken as immaterial and impertinent to the matters at issue in this Opposition.

5

8

14 15

13

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

#### II. Applicant's Response is Untimely

- Applicant has established an undeniable pattern of dilatory tactics and severe 11. neglect throughout these proceedings. Kittrich filed its Notice of Opposition on July 24th, 2013. Following Applicant's failure to timely answer the Notice, the Board granted Applicant forty additional days, until November 16th, 2013, in which to file an answer that is in compliance with applicable procedure. Even with the additional time, Applicant's only action was to file the untimely and incomplete Response on November 19th, 2013 or November 20th, 2013, which fails to comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and to give Kittrich notice of which allegations Applicant has denied and admitted, and of what defenses, if any, it claims.
- Applicant's Response is untimely as it was filed at least 3 days after the due date, 12. and therefore should be rejected by the Board on this basis.
- Applicant has had multiple opportunities to defend itself and continues to flaunt 13. applicable procedure, exerting only the minimal effort required to essentially string this Board along, while requiring Kittrich to continue expending effort and money to try and coax Applicant into actually fulfilling its obligations pursuant to the Board's procedure. Kittrich should not be required to continue chasing the Applicant merely to obtain its involvement in these proceedings, and Applicant should not benefit from its dilatory tactics any longer. Kittrich has been prejudiced and would be further prejudiced if these tactics were allowed to continue, and requests that the Response be stricken as untimely.

WHEREFORE, Kittrich Corporation respectfully requests that the Board issue an order striking the Applicant's Response in its entirety due to its untimely filing, and its failure to comply with applicable rules, including Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(b) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(f). Kittrich further requests that the Board sustain Kittrich's pending Motion for Default Judgment.

28

29

1	DATED: November 26 <sup>th</sup> , 2013	
2		
3		Respectfully submitted,
4		MADIZ A CALIZDIO
5		MARK A. CALKINS KITTRICH CORPORATION
6		14555 Alondra Blvd. La Mirada, CA 90638
7		Telephone: (714) 736-1044 Facsimile: (714) 736-2000
8		1 100 11 1
9		190 N. C.
10		MARK A. CALKINS Vice President
11		Kittrich Corporation
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19	,	
20		
21	•	
22		
23		·
24		
25		
	II	

28

29

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing MOTION TO STRIKE APPLICANT'S RESPONSE has been served via email and First Class Mail on Applicant at the address below, on this 26<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2013: LISA JULIAN LITTLE TWIGS LLC 1317 CABRILLO AVE **VENICE, CA 90291** UNITED STATES Dated: November 26<sup>th</sup>, 2013 By: